



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #1305NJ-1 for Hamilton Township Public Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	0
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Hamilton Township Public Schools does not provide a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in the four core educational assurance areas. HTPS did not articulate a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity. HTPS is proposing to provide an after-school homework assistance program for elementary, middle, and high as well as an early intervention program for current kindergartners at 7 Title I schools and parent training sessions/support. However, there is no evidence of expanding current practices and/or successes with the proposed plan.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Hamilton Township Public Schools (HTPS) provided evidence to support an approach to implement the proposed plan. HTPS listed the schools that will participate in the grant. Also, HTPS provided evidence for the total number of participating students (2556), participating students from low income families (2077), participating students who are high need (546), and participating educators (30). There is no evidence of the process for selecting participating schools.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	0
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Hamilton Township Public Schools plan is to improve the academic performance of low income students through an extension of educational opportunities and social-emotional activities. However, there is no evidence of how the proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools listed in the proposal.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Hamilton Township Public Schools provided goals for improving district-wide student achievement. However, the goal areas were ambiguous and HTPS did not provide specific areas of focus and information pertaining to the assessments used to measure student proficiency. HTPS set ambitious yet achievable annual goals which totaled to over 10% increase over four years. However, HTPS did not propose ambitious annual goals for decreasing achievement gaps by subgroups. Furthermore, HTPS did not set ambitious annual goals for the graduation rates which included only a 1% annual increase. HTPS provided college enrollment that included students who enrolled in post-secondary institutions during the 16 months after high school graduation; however, there is no evidence of an ambitious annual goal. HTPS proposed an annual increase of 1% each year for college enrollment. Also, HTPS provided post-secondary degree attainment information using data from local colleges/universities; however, this information is not accurate since it does not include data for students who may have attended colleges/universities out of the local area. The data for post-secondary degree attainment is insufficient.</p>		

### B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	0

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools did not demonstrate evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years. HTPS referenced different initiatives; however, there is no data on student outcomes due to the implementation of the different initiatives. There is no evidence to make student performance data available to stakeholders in ways that inform and improve their participation, instruction, and services. Also, there is no evidence of successes in current and/or previous reforms to meet the needs of students in their low-performing schools.		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools demonstrated evidence of high level transparency in actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school level instructional and support staff as well as non personnel expenditures at the school level. HTPS provides this data on the district website and are required by the state of New Jersey to provide this data to the public.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools does not provide evidence for successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements.		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools demonstrated evidence for engaging teachers, administrators, and community members in the support of the proposal; however, there is no evidence of how students, families, teachers, and principals were engaged in the development of the proposal. HTPS fulfilled only half of the requirements for stakeholder engagement and support. HTPS provided evidence for meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal; however, no evidence for meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal.		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	0
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools does not demonstrate evidence of a high quality plan for an analysis of their current implementation of personalized learning environments. Furthermore, HTPS does not demonstrate evidence for identification of specific needs and gaps that will be addressed in the plan.		

### C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools does not provide evidence for all students to be able to understand what they are learning as well as identify learning goals linked to college and career requirements. HTPS provided evidence that all students will have access to a web based system with real time access to the student data housed in the system as well as development of an individualized multi-year "success" plan for every student; however, there is not evidence of specific information that is included in the system. Also, there is no evidence of ongoing and regular feedback to students regarding their academic performance. HTPS did not provide evidence for a mechanism to provide training and support to students that will ensure how to use the tools such as the web based system.		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools provided evidence of supporting teachers through training using structures such as School		

as a Learning Community and IMPACT Instructional Practice. HTPS provided evidence of a classroom walkthrough protocol to accelerate improvement in the classroom by analyzing walkthrough data. Also, there was evidence of HTPS establishing a common language to define teacher practice in their schools. There is evidence of actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools provided evidence of a central office structured to support all participating schools. Also, there is evidence of a school leadership team for each participating school; however, there is no evidence of sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and staffing. HTPS provided evidence that there are specific measures to determine student mastery of objectives; however, there is no evidence that HTPS has the autonomy to provide students with opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and multiple comparable ways.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	0
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools does not provide evidence to ensure all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have access to necessary content and learning resources regardless of income. HTPS referenced different training, online learning, and self-selected professional learning; however, there is no evidence of ensuring these levels of technical support will be provided to parents and students. Also, there is no evidence to ensure LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems .		

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools does not provide evidence for a continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on the progress of project goals. HTPS provides evidence of how the project goals will be measured through such assessments as the Developmental Reading Assessment 2 and district benchmark assessments; however, there is no evidence of how HTPS will publicly share information on the quality of its investments using Race to the Top - District funds.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	0
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools does not provide evidence for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools demonstrated evidence of performance measures and provided a rationale for the performance measure. HTPS proposed at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator and at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator for all, PreK-3, 4-8, and 9-12 grades. HTPS provided evidence of how they will review measure over time; however, there is no evidence of how it will improve if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. HTPS did provide evidence of between 12-14 performance measures. The performance measures proposed are ambitious yet achievable.		

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools did not provide evidence of a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top - District funded activities.		

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	0
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools identifies funding from the Race to the Top - District grant; however, there is no evidence of financial support from other entities (i.e. state, local, other funding sources). HTPS provided a description of funds; however, with no additional funding sources listed the budget proposal is unreasonable and insufficient.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools does not provide evidence to sustain the project goals after the term of the grant. HTPS did not provide evidence for other funding sources other than the Race to the Top - District grant.		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools will partner with local community centers to provide parents opportunities to learn how to support their children at home. HTPS provided evidence for engaging parents and families of participating students in decision making. HTPS provided evidence of population level desired outcomes and identified the population group and type of outcome (educational or family and community). HTPS outcomes were ambitious and achievable as well as aligned with the project goals.		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Hamilton Township Public Schools did not meet the requirements of Absolute Priority 1. HTPS did not provide adequate evidence for providing a personalized learning environment to accelerate student learning, decrease achievement gaps, and increase graduation rates. There is limited supporting documents to ensure HTPS will be able to sustain proposal goals after the grant period. Also, there is insufficient evidence of prior success in HTPS to support proposed activities.		

Total	210	71
-------	-----	----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #1305NJ-2 for Hamilton Township Public Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>LEA's vision statement proclaims a commitment to provide a learning environment that is personalized, to serve all of its high-needs students, and to address their educational (including graduation requirements) and behavioral-social needs through expanded day services. Support will be based on a high quality plan that will draw upon evidence from research and past successful programs that utilize school district and community locations and resources to deliver the needed services.</p> <p>The applicant has identified and plans to provide for the need for homework and tutorial assistance, training for parents in homework and reading strategies, parent training in conflict resolution strategies, greater participation of parents in school activities, and community support programs for the families of English learners.</p> <p>A clear and credible approach is evident in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The vision truly hones into addressing the needs of high-needs students through a personalized environment, in the most practical way feasible in a small LEA.;</li> <li>• Data-based decisions for addressing educational and social needs of students, involving all stakeholders.</li> <li>• Enhanced credibility due to LEA's open admission that the proposed program is an enhancement of a previous federal funded program within its schools.</li> </ul> <p>Consequently, a Perfect/Maximum allowable score is assigned for this criterion.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This is a bite-sized practical approach applicable for a small LEA like the applicant.</p> <p>The applicant has presented a coherent approach for an afterschool program in its schools that pool the services available within the target school communities, LEA's schools and neighborhood centers. The program will focus primarily on a comprehensive plan for extending the educational opportunities and expanding the social-emotional activities to high-risk and low-income students. Seven (7) elementary schools and four(4) middle/secondary schools will provide a comprehensive after school tutorial program, meals, summer library enrichment activities, tutoring for English learners and parents, parent training in conflict resolution and "at home" literacy projects, and tuition assistance for after school care where applicable.</p> <p>LEA's plan includes provision for involvement of a broad-based group of stakeholders. A team consisting of parent/guardian, project Supervisor, home-school principal, guidance counselor and one teacher will develop an individual program plan (IPP).</p> <p>LEA plans to use a variety of data in the process of planning and providing the proposed services. The process involves gathering of student (academic, attendance and behavioral) data, determine needs based on the student's graduation requirements, and develop the IPP.</p> <p>Consequently, a Perfect/Maximum allowable score is assigned for this criterion.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The proposed project is a district-wide project and thus scaling up is not a factor to consider. The applicant plans to serve all high-needs students, representing 50% of all and 80% of low-income students enrolled in the district. All five (5) elementary, two (2) middle and (2) high schools of the district will participate in the project. A research-based approach to ensure academic success for high-needs students is presented.

The project will effectively use expanding community resources together with school resources to bring about district wide changes and reach its outcome goals.

Thus, a Perfect/Maximum allowable score is assigned for this criterion.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

LEA's application includes ambitious yet achievable annual goals for student outcomes in the areas of language arts and mathematics. Both district level and school level goals are included.

Applicant has demonstrated that the applicant's vision has potential to result in improved student learning and performance, and increased equity.

Academic, graduation and college enrollment annual goals and targets are set and they reflect LEA's efforts to reduce sub-group gaps in these areas.

There is no evidence to suggest that the applicant has set performance targets for high need student group. Rating points are deducted for this lack of evidence.

A low High-level rating is given for this criterion.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has demonstrated with evidence that it has the ability to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps. A comparison of performance data for 2010-11 and 2011-2012, provided in the RTT-D standard tables, confirms this capability.

LEA has proclaimed its capability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its lowest achieving and low performing schools. LEA has based its proposed project on successful programs/services implemented in its schools during the past few years. Applicant provides a descriptive list of successful programs, systemic initiatives, and data-driven strategies implemented in the district, and titles of reports on programs with demonstrated improvement.

A version of the proposed Hamilton Alternative High School Program was successfully implemented in 2008. The program was driven by each student's Individual Program Plan, which is a personalized student learning plan for both regular education students and students with IEP's to customize the learning according to the individual needs of the student. It is the structure of this program on which the Hamilton Collaborative Expanded Day Program will be based.

The LEA makes student performance data available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction and services. At the start of every school year, the district provides an annual report of Student Assessment Data to the Board of Education and the community at large. It shows three year data and trends. School improvement teams, in place in all 23 schools base their improvement plans on the school level *New Jersey School Report Card* and a variety of other relevant data.

No evidence of effectiveness or success of implementation of the prior programs is presented. The suggested data, from past four years' success in advancing student learning, and increasing equity in learning and teaching, are not included.

Consequently, a low High-level score is assigned for this criterion.

[Note: As stated in the application, the district intended to present relevant reports in the appendix section. There are no reports in the appendix of the submitted application.]

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

LEA has presented the minimum required data on school level salaries for personnel, instructional salaries, teacher salaries, and non-personnel expenditure.

Applicant has made a statement regarding presence of such transparencies in the district Website. No evidence is provided to substantiate these statements.

A high Mid-level score is assigned for this sub-criterion.

[Note: As stated in the application, the district intended to present relevant reports in the appendix section. There are no reports in the appendix of the submitted application. ]

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has successful conditions, sufficient autonomy, and adequate flexibility under State, legal, statutory and regulatory requirements, as demonstrated by the programs implemented in the district. The district has already implemented significant reforms autonomously with support from the State and partnering institutions. A number of Intervention programs have been implemented in the district.

No supporting evidence is presented.

A low High-level score is assigned for this criterion

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There is evidence of meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal, as demonstrated by letters of support from multiple sources, including the required State and City officials. The applicant has included evidence supporting the claim that State, county and community organizations have been involved in a number of school improvement efforts.

The applicant has presented in detail the process through which it involved stakeholders in the process of developing the application. In developing this proposal, the district engaged with all staff members at the district level, all building principals were surveyed and their suggestions were incorporated in the grant. Both the teachers' union president and local board of education president were involved with developing the strategies in this grant. Letters of support from local YMCA, the school Parent Teacher Associations (PTA) and from the Wilson Center are presented in the appendix. The district engaged the PTA, students, teachers and local community members in the analysis and design of the grant. A meeting was held to explain the grant with prospective partners and the team brainstormed areas of need in order to support the RTTD grant.

Thus a Perfect/Maximum Allowable score is assigned

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Statements in the application show that the applicant has performed an analysis of its current status in implementing personalized learning environments. The applicant has NOT demonstrated evidence for the logic behind the reform proposal, including the identified needs and gaps that the plan will address. In response to selection criterion (B) (5), the applicant has identified a number of gaps and what measures it is already implementing and those this LEA plans to initiate.

As required by the New Jersey Department of Education, the LEA prepares for every high school student who did not

demonstrate proficiency on standardized State testing, a need-based individual *Educational Proficiency Plan* or EPP. The plan is developed and reviewed by school personnel to determine what a specific student needs, how best he or she learns, and the strategies that we must employ in the classroom so that the student successfully learns.

Applicant did not identify educational performance gaps among subgroups, including the high needs groups.

Thus a Low-level score is assigned for this sub-criterion.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has presented a comprehensive <i>High-quality plan</i>, for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment and seeing that each student's academic, social and emotional needs are addressed responsively. The proposed expanded-day support program focuses on educational services that take them through graduation and post-secondary placement. The plan presented in response to criterion (C)(1) includes an approach to implementing instructional strategies that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college and career ready graduation requirements, and accelerate the student's learning through support of that individual's needs.</p> <p>There is evidence in the application showing that the emphasis is on college and career ready graduation goals, educational programs and partnerships that support this goal, instructional strategies implemented in a personalized environment, progress monitored continuously, and aligned with the State standards. Student progress is promoted and accelerated as needed. Transitional programs will be offered in the form of internships, in which students can obtain meaningful experience in an area of interest in the community and receive credit for the experience. The applicant and partner colleges make sure that college courses offered to high school students are acceptable for both a college degree and high school graduation requirements.</p> <p>The applicant has demonstrated that it is knowledgeable about and responsive to the needs of high needs students, including English language learners and students with disabilities.</p> <p>The strategies and action elements included in the narrative makes the proposed plan credible.</p> <p>Only generic responsibilities and timelines are provided. Deliverables are implied in the narratives.</p> <p>No evidence is presented to corroborate the claim that the application was developed in consultation with school principals and tethe teachers' union.</p> <p>A mid High-level score is assigned for this criterion.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has a high-quality plan for improving teaching and learning by personalizing teaching and learning. LEA has provided detailed description of activities designed to deliver personalized instruction with building level and district level support.</p> <p>The plan includes an approach to implementing instructional strategies that accelerate student learning through supporting the individual's needs.</p> <p>The staff members and partner providers have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress. They are provided with actionable information , high-quality learning resources, and processes and tools to match student needs</p> <p>Thus, the district proposed activities contribute to possible full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students.</p> <p>The proposed professional development and support services to teachers and other personnel ensure that there is a continual increase in the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.</p> <p>LEA has in place training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective personalized learning environment that enable them to assist students to meet college- and career-ready standards The training, policies, tools,</p>		



data, and resources include teacher evaluation and training systems that contribute to collective educator effectiveness and continuous improvement of school progress toward its goals .

The applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. The district and partner colleges collaborate to ensure that college courses offered to high school students taught by academic ranking faculty and are acceptable for both a college degree and high school graduation requirements. The applicant espouses the belief that content of instruction must be based on research-based ideas and instruction must be within a learning community that believes in the students and supports their journey, rather than in a custodial or strict environment that punishes or strongly disciplines students rather than that guides them to be in full control of their talents. The ideas proposed in this section adhere to this belief.

Only generic responsibilities and timelines are provided. Deliverables are implied in the narratives.

NO evidence to corroborate the claim that principals and teachers union were involved in the planning process is presented.

Thus a mid High-level score is assigned for this cub-criterion.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	6
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>POSITIVES</b></p> <p>LEA has identified/selected practices, policies and rules of the LEA provide for flexibility and autonomy needed for designing programs that foster personalized learning environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. Students are given multiple opportunities and multiple ways to demonstrate mastery. Learning resources are adaptable and fully accessible to all students.</li> <li>The applicant has implemented and is proposing to implement what is referred to as Option II learning opportunities for personalized learning beyond the school day and outside of traditional school experiences.</li> <li>The high school graduation credit requirement may be met in whole or in part through program completion of a range of experiences that enable pupils to pursue a variety of personalized learning opportunities, including dual credits to applicable to both college and high school requirements.</li> <li>The district is emphasizing multiple measures of evidence to be reviewed for student success.</li> <li>The district technology department provides a variety of support for providing a thorough and efficient education for our students through the information in the LEA's data base. Software for the database as well as instructional use is reviewed by the technology team and the curriculum staff so that they complement the curriculum and learning aligned with the core standards.</li> </ul> <p><b>NEGATIVES:</b></p> <p>No evidence supporting the claims of past successes with the approach, and district's technology and data capabilities that will corroborate to its stated capacity to implement the teaching-learning initiatives effectively.</p> <p>A low Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>LEA has provided a general description of the within school/district technological applications necessary for data/information management and support. The current level of technological infrastructure provides school and LEA staff and other stakeholders in the community with necessary information about programs, schools and the district.</p> <p>The infrastructure does exist in the applicant's district and allows the LEA to implement the Hamilton Collaborative Education Plan (HCEDP) for services within the context of an extended teaching-learning community. The district plans to incorporate the support system present for the regular school day into the extended learning programs at the four locations of the HCEDP. In addition, the LEA proposes to effectively use resources and support from the community centers. Because parents and</p>		

family members are already familiar with the community centers, they may feel comfortable in participating in the satellite activities.

Applicant plans to purchase technology that will increase access for low-income families and students. Acquired laptops and iPads will be purchased to create mobile learning labs that could be used at home and school. Extended hours would allow students and parents to use technology in the school library and this increased access will permit students to gather information and more effectively complete assignments.

A perfect score is assigned for this criterion.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Throughout the application LEA has incorporated details of data usage and its continuous improvement process, which drive decision-making and evaluation with real-time data regarding all aspects of reform including student performance, professional development, the employment of technology, community partnerships, and the use of staff, time, money and other resources.</p> <p>For example, the use of <i>Teachscape</i>, an innovative data collection and reporting technology, combined with its research-based seven stage classroom walkthrough process, provides a framework for reflective discussions, data analysis, action planning, and program monitoring. This methodology helps instructional leaders continuously improve and adapt classroom practices to increase student achievement.</p> <p>The following is not a weakness. Unlike its practice of responding to each sub-criterion individually, the applicant did not address this sub-criterion separately.</p> <p>Thus, a Perfect score is assigned.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Ideas relevant to monitoring, measuring and publicly sharing information on the quality of the LEA's project-funded investment along with outline of strategies for ongoing communication and engagement are provided throughout the application, and briefly within this section in response to this criterion.</p> <p>Some of the evidence of this presence are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed project will facilitate communication with classroom teachers and other on site staff on a routine basis and foster participation in training sessions, planning sessions, lesson plans and other means of communication to reinforce and enrich concepts taught in school.</li> <li>• Members of the before/after school management team will collaborate with school administrators to facilitate the project plan and assess the results of each activity.</li> <li>• Project supervisors, after school tutors and librarians and will support the schools efforts to increase students' academic performance and social skills by adhering to the program plan and participating in the planning of events and conducting assessments.</li> <li>• With a purpose that students experience success in the program, parents will be asked to be involved in their child's entry conference, Individual Program Plan development, parent-teacher conferences, and parent-teacher-supervisor conferences. Increased student to adult support ratio is planned, so that improved communication and planning between counselor, student, and parent/guardian will be effected.</li> </ul> <p>Thus, a Perfect score is assigned.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Ambitious and achievable performance measures with annual targets are specified for qualified and highly qualified instructional and administrative staff. Baseline and annual targets are provided for each school. It is noted that the baseline status itself is at 99-100%, and thus the applicant is showing commitment to maintain these levels over the project years and the first year after the end of Federal funding for the project. It appears that the applicant continued the list it started with performance measure *All Applicants –a* into the table designated for *All Applicants –b*.

Ambitious and achievable performance targets are set for student outcomes. It is not clear as to the process that was used for calculating percentages for the 9-12 *Free Application for Federal Student Aid* form (FAFSA) entries. Either the percentages or wrong or the targets for minority groups are not ambitious. A conclusion cannot be drawn in the absence clarity.

State required growth targets are presented as rationale for selecting the specific performance measures and targets. The capacity of the selected performance measures to provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information is described elsewhere in the application. The selected performance measures include both annual measures and formative benchmark assessment. Rigorous, timely and formative leading information will be available to the applicant.

Issues like performance measures appropriate for high need students, including language/accessibility supports, are only mentioned in passing. There is no demonstrated evidence of using data from these assessments. Student subgroup level performance indicators and targets for high-needs groups (disaggregated performance targets) are not provided.

Thus a Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A relatively comprehensive, but of moderate quality, plan to evaluate the effectiveness of significant RTT-D funded activities is presented. Applicant describes what activities will be performed with what purpose and how it will evaluate the outcomes of those activities.

There is no plan for an overall evaluation and reporting of project performance. It is not clear as to who will be responsible for the overall evaluation of program investments and effectiveness and what methods will be used for this purpose. No detail is provided.

Thus an upper Mid-level score is assigned for this criterion.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In the *Overall Budget Summary* and associated narrative the applicant:

- Applicant identified all funds that will support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal;
- No other the fund has been identified for support of the implementation of the proposal;
- Textbooks, supplies and equipment from the home schools (local funds) will be available to share as resources. Larger items such as copiers and computers are also shared;
- The applicant has provided limited or no description of total revenues from other sources that the applicant will use to support implementation of specific element s of the proposal.

There are some observations on the sufficiency/reasonableness of the budget from the overall budget summary:

- LEA has not requested for any indirect cost in the budget.
- There is no annual cost of living increase applied to the Personnel - salaries line. Again, This could be positive or negative form the point of view of frugality, lack of planning or restrictions;

Project level budget summary form is provided which in fact is a budget line item justification for the total project.

Based on these observations, a Low-level score is assigned for this criterion.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant did not address this criterion anywhere in the application.</p> <p>Based on the failure to address this criterion, a zero score is assigned for this criterion.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has presented a plan for a coherent and sustainable partnership with Robert Wood Johnson Hospital in order to provide social work and psychology services to the LEA's children and families, and thus to increase student achievement and parental involvement. Additionally, as part of the grant the applicant is partnering with two community centers.</p> <p>Applicant has provided sufficient number of population level desired results that align with and support the applicant's broader RTT-D proposal. Ambitious yet achievable performance measures have been set as desired results for students.</p> <p>Services such as housing assistance, addressing issues of homelessness, food and clothing assistance, job training and support, and supplemental educational services for children and families will be offered as part of these partnerships. Priorities include social service connections as well as family therapy for young children starting at the age five (5) which will help our struggling kindergarten students and their families achieve their family goals.</p> <p>The <i>Epstein model of Six Types of Involvement</i> (Johns Hopkins University), will be adopted by the partnership, to provide a research-based framework that ties family and community involvement in schools to produce positive student outcomes. The Epstein model is the basis for the <i>National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement</i> developed by the National PTA and the National Coalition for Parent Involvement.</p> <p>The proposed partnership will build the capacity of staff in participating schools.</p> <p>Strategies for targeting resources, tracking selected indicators, and improving results are presented elsewhere in the proposal. Because applicant plans to serve all eligible student and families, scaling up (not applicable in the case of this LEA).</p> <p>Thus, a Perfect score is assigned.</p>		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant's vision is truly comprehensive in that it fully encompasses the spirit of RTT-D's <i>Absolute Priority 1</i>, and thoughtfully addresses the <i>Core Educational Assurance Areas</i>. The applicant has articulated a clear and credible approach, and plans of action throughout the proposal. Key elements relevant to <i>Absolute Priority 1</i> addressed by the plans are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>College- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The district and partner colleges will ensure that college courses offered to high school students are courses</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

acceptable for both a college degree and high school graduation requirements. The board of education of the LEA and partner colleges will ensure that college courses for high school students are taught by college faculty with academic rank.

- Accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student;
  - The proposed intervention is an individual oriented support system specifically tailored for the needs of individual students;
- Increase the effectiveness of educators;
  -
- Expand student access to the most effective educators
  - Teachscape Classroom Walkthrough and the Danielson Model, proposed to be used are iterative processes for instructional improvement that guide school communities through collecting and analyzing data. The walkthrough process promotes focused dialogue about teaching and learning and is a continuous improvement process that translates data into practical actions steps. Through this system, new teachers that are ineffective and existing teachers that need assistance will receive assistance from an instructional coach utilizing an ongoing coaching model.
  - Data provided in table associated with E(3) shows that the LEA has a minimum of 99% - 100% highly effective teachers across the board, and their target is to maintain this level of staffing quality.
- Decrease achievement gaps across student groups
  - The performance targets provided in the relevant table, and the proposed intervention plan together confirm this commitment; and
- Increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers
  - The performance targets in the relevant tables (post secondary enrollment and post secondary graduation) together with the action plan for college and career readiness presented in the narrative under relevant sections confirm this commitment.

The application also addresses the four key areas originally identified in the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) to support comprehensive education reform: adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction; recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and turning around lowest-achieving schools.

As a result, the applicant has MET the **Absolute Priority 1** criterion.

Total	210	155
-------	-----	-----



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #1305NJ-3 for Hamilton Township Public Schools

#### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identifies early intervention and parental support as the keys to reform. The applicant proposes to address early intervention for the academically lowest five percent of kindergarten students in seven of its Title I schools. Due to space restrictions, the applicant doesn't have the option of offering preschool classes. In 2012, the applicant has used the Brigrance

screening tool to assess students' growth and they have seen a five percent growth this year. The applicant also states kindergarten will become a team teaching environment one additional kindergarten teacher (per school) will be hired for additional support.

Additional parental support will be provided through additional staffing at two community centers (social worker and psychologist) to assist families with housing, clothing, gas and electrical assistance, educational programs, and career seminars. The applicant details eight guiding principles for the project, all of which build upon the four educational assurance areas.

However, the applicant also identified the need for additional tutoring assistance, training for parents on homework and reading strategies, and community support programs for the families of non English speaking students. It is unclear how the two projects detailed by the applicant will meet any of these needs.

The applicant refers to the project as "The Hamilton Collaborative Extended Day Project," however it is unclear how the two keys to reform identified will be primarily extended day opportunities.

Overall this was a medium scored response. While the applicant provided most of the criterion objectives, the applicant also stated several needs that were not addressed in with of the two projects.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, the applicant identifies four locations programming will be based including two elementary consortiums, one middle school consortium, and one high school consortium. In section (A)(1), the applicant only detailed reform needs for elementary school students, specifically kindergarten.

The applicant states it will rekindle a previous 21st century community learning centers program that was grant funded. It is unclear why this program needs to be rekindled. It is also stated the district will re-establish a partnership with the afterschool providers. Again, no details are provided as to why these providers do not currently have relationships with the district. There is also a charge for afterschool services that are provided by the Hamilton Area CYO and the YMCA which the applicant states assistance will be provided to the families. With the high percentage of low-income students being proposed to be served by this RtT-D application, it is unrealistic to only provide support to the aforementioned families.

Data is provided by the applicant including the number of participating educators and students. Having only three staff per school as part of the proposal does not make any sense whatsoever. Especially when each school has anywhere from 110 to 597 participating students. There must be a significant increase to the number of participating educators to support the number of participating students and to even consider district-wide reform will occur.

The percentages of participating students from low-income families meets the requirements of the RtT-D application.

Although not a requirement of this particular criterion, the applicant provides criteria for program participants including attendance, behavioral expectations, and parental involvement. It is also mentioned how concerns of the community will be addressed. It is confusing why these components were included in this section, although no points were deducted for this particular reason.

Overall the applicant provided the details necessary, however, the number of participating educators is extremely low and confusing. And a rationale has yet to be provided for the middle and high school programs.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide a high quality plan to address LEA-wide reform and change. Most of the goals listed are not measurable. For example: "To ensure that every student develops skills to become a competent, confident, motivated reader." A time is not provided. All students (elementary through high school) is unrealistic. It is impossible to measure confidence and motivation with regards to reading. Another goal states programs will nurture the love of books. Again, not measurable.

There are no specific strategies provided for achieving any of the stated goals.

The applicant lists positions and responsibilities, however, none of them are tied to the grant. They are current positions with current responsibilities. The additional teachers and staff mentioned in section (A)(1) are not included in this section. Also, it states the school nurse is responsible for career planning and/or job placement for every student. This is very confusing. A student assistance counselor will assist students and families with problems related to substance abuse. There is no rationale for this position or need defined by data. It is also confusing why an introductory Spanish teacher is listed here.

The applicant states strong staff development and adequate planning time are crucial to the program's success, yet no strategies for achieving these components are included. The applicant also states effective teachers of high-risk students have diverse leisure time activities, yet no details regarding how this will be assessed or measured for LEA-wide reform.

This is a weak response with little substance to support the applicant's ability or vision to implement the program described or scale-up the program.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide a narrative for this criterion. Based on the previous sections, it is unclear if the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity due to the fact that the strategies for the extended day program, additional kindergarten teachers and instructional focus, and increased parental support at two community centers are lacking.

The applicant provided data for each participating elementary, middle, and high school overall and by subgroup for language arts and mathematics performance. The measure being utilized was not provided, therefore it is unclear as to whether the proposed annual targets meet or exceed the state targets.

In all cases the projected targets decreased achievement gaps for the subgroups. In most cases the decrease was approximately 50%. There were some targets which resulted in decreased growth in some school. For example: Language arts scores for McGallard School for black students were eight percentage points higher than all students in 2011-2012, but in 2016-2017 only four points higher.

In all cases there was a significantly lower performance score for special education students. Strategies mentioned thus far are in place for low-income students, not special education students.

The language arts scores for Nottingham High School were significantly higher than all other schools. The applicant did not provide data on the participating students and educators from Nottingham High School in the chart in section (A)(2).

Mathematics scores also decreased achievement gaps, however there were a few examples of non-growth. For example: Klockner School projected annual the same annual target for white students in years 2011-2014 and in 2014-2017.

There were also some targets that were achievable, but not ambitious. For example: Greenwood School's black mathematics scores only increased two percentage points each year resulting in a final target of 85.9 percent, only 2.2 points lesser than the overall average. It is unclear why the applicant did not project to eliminate the achievement gap for black students at this school in mathematics completely.

The graduation rates and annual targets were provided. Annual gains of one percent were expected for all subgroups. This is not ambitious and does not decrease the achievement gap that currently exists. The current gap is minimal and is not addressed through the applicant's RtT-D proposal.

The college enrollment rates showed significant gaps between white students and both black and Hispanic students, yet the gaps are projected to remain exactly the same through the duration of the grant.

Postsecondary degree attainment measures and projections were included for black and Hispanic students and overall. It is unclear why the information was not provided for white students.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	0

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

While the applicant describes several initiatives that have been successfully implemented in the district, they are unable to connect those initiatives with student achievement. In fact, that applicant states there are significant achievement gaps for the following subgroups: black, economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, and special education. The district is also behind the District Factor Group and the state in test scores. The graduation data provided on chart (A)(4)(c) shows an overall decrease in graduation rates from 2010 to 2011 of four percentage points.

The applicant states success has been achieved through an alternative high school, however, this is not a desirable method

for eliminating achievement gaps, increasing student equity, and reforming low achieving schools.

The applicant refers to several reports, but does not detail how or if these are disseminated to key stakeholders. Also, the applicant states the reports are available in the appendix, but they are not.

The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to meet any of the objectives listed in this criterion.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a chart with salary budgets for each school and stated this chart is available on the district's website. However, these are not actual personnel salaries at the school level. Also, the applicant stated attachments are in the appendix, but they are not.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strategies for focusing on personalized learning environments including cohorts, looping, advisories, student choice, and mentors. These are appropriate tactics to achieve the reform stated. The applicant also states the district has committed to the Danielson model for teacher and principal evaluations in 2012-2013 and provides examples of professional practice recommended by Danielson. Since this evaluation system has not been implemented in the district, it is not considered demonstrated evidence.

The applicant also stated the district follows all legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements, but did not address local autonomy guidelines.

Overall this was a medium response.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	0
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant stated the district "will engage in strategic planning....will conduct needs assessments to determine needed supports and services; research best practices..." This is evidence that stakeholders were not engaged in the development. Also a needs assessment and research does not seem to have been part of the RttT-D development process.

The applicant also stated that the development of the proposal included staff members at the district level and principals were surveyed. There is no mention of teacher involvement and the president of the local teacher's union did not sign the signature page of the application. In fact, neither did the school board president or superintendent. The survey results of the principals was not detailed either.

The only letters of support included were the YMCA, Wilson Center, and from the PTA presidents at two schools (Klockner and Lalor). There were no support letters from any principals, the 22 other parent teacher organizations, or previously mentioned community partners other than the YMCA and Wilson Center. There was no evidence of communication with the local government either.

This response did not meet any of the criterion objectives.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant documents several different strategies to analyze the implementation of personalized learning environments including standardized state assessments, locally developed assessments, LinkIT benchmarking software, state performance targets, Pupil Performance Objectives, schedules, and Educational Proficiency Plans. These will aide the district in determine needs and gaps, but the applicant did not identify needs and gaps in this response. The rationale for the reform efforts is not identified in this response.

The applicant provides details regarding who is responsible for each strategy and how often/when they will take place.

Overall the applicant stated a plan for the analysis of implementing personalized learning environments, but did not identify current needs and gaps or provide a rationale.



# C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	3
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant details components of successful lessons to address student diversity, however, there has been no mention of professional development for teachers to ensure all teachers are including these components. The list included several ideas that can take years to master and include effectively, such as differentiation. The applicant also refers to career awareness state standards 9.1 and 9.2 and states these should be integrated throughout the curriculum, but offers no plan to do so. The applicant also refers to transitional services including internships for students, but no information regarding how many students are eligible or what grades/classes this takes place are provided.</p> <p>Several college dual enrollment options are listed, but all have significant and traditional barriers that exist for low-income families such as: completing a college application, cost of course, and having to take the initiative to complete and submit the paperwork to guidance.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan to provide deep learning in areas of academic interest, exposure to diverse cultures, master 21st century skills, include parents in the support network, provide opportunities to use digital learning content, or to ensure mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students on how to manage and track their learning. These are several key objectives that were not addressed by the applicant.</p> <p>Throughout this section it is unclear how the extended day program, kindergarten additions, or two enhanced parent community centers will support and objectives within this criterion. Most of the college dual enrollment opportunities detailed were not for "all" students, but appeared to be for a select few students. This is not how district-wide reform is achieved.</p> <p>The applicant states there is a web-based data system with real time access to students and parents.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	2
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant mentioned continuing and further developing its professional learning communities (PLC) to establish student-centered environments. The applicant also continued to refer to the Danielson Framework for teacher evaluations.</p> <p>The applicant also made reference twice to implementing a 1:1 computing environment, but no other details were provided and this has not been mentioned in the proposal thus far such as a need, gap, or strategy for achieving RtT-D goals. The applicant also stated several paragraphs later that the district is remotely ineffective with its current technology capacity including proper Internet connectivity. This is clearly a need that needs to be addressed before a 1:1 initiative is discussed.</p> <p>Several of the objectives in this criterion appeared to be included verbatim and then attached to a few words, such as, "deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest; personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development" was preceded by NJ Pathways. It is insufficient to state this alone.</p> <p>The applicant referred to Teachscape, which sounded promising due to the use of technology and reiteration of teacher evaluation in real time.</p> <p>This response was confusing for the most part and when the applicant appeared to be addressing the criterion objectives, they were merely being restated without any component of a high-quality plan. There were no timelines, persons responsible, strategies, rationale, or goals.</p>		

# D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided sufficient details regarding the structure of the district office to provide sufficient and timely response and support to the participating schools. School leadership teams have already been formed, but their autonomy was not</p>		

clearly detailed. Although in a previous section the applicant did state seat time for completion of a course was not a requirement.

The applicant sufficiently addressed a variety of learning standards and instructional strategies for students to use and added ESL programs would provide programs and services to ensure specific components of the program were addressed. The applicant did not mention any specialized services or accommodations for students with disabilities. This was a requirement and due to the significantly low performance scores, it should have been addressed.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

0

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not specifically address any components of this criterion. The applicant also does not provide details for ensuring all participating students are able to take advantage of the extended day program and still remain connected to regular school activities such as clubs and athletics. Participating in a four-hour program after school everyday and on Saturday is a significant time commitment that can not be mandated by the district.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	0
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not respond to or address criterion (E)(1).		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	0
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not respond to or address criterion (E)(2).		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provided performance measures, but did not provide its rationale for selecting each measure, detail how the measure will provide tailored information to each student, and did not provide a plan for reviewing the targets and gauging success of the program specific to each performance measure identified.  The data within most of the performance charts appeared to be inaccurate. Examples:  1. The percentage of highly effective teachers is 100%. The definition of highly effective is for students to gain 1.5 years of growth in one year. There is no data to support this has occurred, in fact the data provided in previous sections stated these types of gains were not occurring. Also only three schools were included in this chart, but 24 are in the proposed program.  2. The percentage of effective teachers is also 100%. Again, there is no data to support this. Only seven schools are included within this performance measure.  3. The first performance measure appears to measure elementary math and language arts and secondary math and language arts. And the percentages for all students and white students and black/Hispanic students are the same throughout the chart.  4. The charts percentages for all students and the two subgroups are the same every target year. Also, the subgroups do not include white, special education, or low-income.  5. The chart states the baseline percentages for all students is 96%, but the three subgroup percentages are all lower than 96%. This is impossible.  The percentage gains expected on the NOCTI assessment are too low, not ambitious. None of the charts, other than teacher/principal effectiveness, are provided in school subgroups like they were in a previous section.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		

The applicant described academic supports for students including benchmark assessments given three times a year in grades two through eight. The district expects a growth of 15 points between the fall and spring test.

The applicant states a strong parent training program will be in place, but there is not a high-quality plan to accompany the statement.

Technology access is further addressed, however, the applicant proposes to offer extended library hours. It is unclear why extended library hours would be offered at the school if students are expected to be in one of the four extended day programs.

There is not a high-quality plan in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the RttT-D investments.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not include any other sources for funding for the RttT-D proposal. There are no one-time investments and all line items remain the same each year of the grant. There are no step increases for the grant director or seven kindergarten teachers.</p> <p>The \$75,000 per year for transportation is reasonable to provide to all participating student to eliminate an obvious barrier for attending the extended day program.</p> <p>The hourly amount for substitute teachers (non-certified and certified) is extremely low, although it may match current district rates.</p> <p>The annual computer supply budget is too low based on the applicant's needs for better technology. Also, the applicant states an online learning package will be purchased, but the technology is not specified so it is unclear how the applicant determined the cost each year would be \$10,000.</p> <p>The rental costs line item of \$20,000 needs to be clarified and is confusing since the partners in the grant are the four locations for the extended day program.</p> <p>The annual travel line item of \$500 is too low.</p> <p>The applicant plans to purchase 25 iPads each year, this is not sufficient for the initiatives described within the proposal. The applicant does not include funding for a charging cart for the technology.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a response to address this criterion. Also, the applicant describes previous unsuccessful attempts to sustain grants including a 21st century community learning centers grant. The applicant does not have a track record of success in sustaining grants and hiring additional staff for the extended day program will not increase the capacity at each school. There are no clear strategies of sustainability included in this proposal.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided a detailed rationale for the need to move from parent involvement to parent engagement. Different levels of engagement and strategies for achieving engagement were also described. The community partner is Robert Wood Johnson Hospital. The hospital will provide social work and psychology services to children and families. The applicant states a rationale for these services as well.</p> <p>While a rationale was provided, the following criterion objectives were not included:</p>		

- Population-level desired results are provided and include social and academic targets, but the measures are not ambitious.
- The applicant does not provide a timeline for implementation or persons responsible.
- It is also unclear how this program will be evaluated for effectiveness and therefore be able to scale-up.

Overall this is a poorly developed partnership lacking all key components of a high-quality plan.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:  The applicant has described a vision to achieve division-wide reform. However, there is no high-quality plan in any of the criteria to support the district's reform vision. It is also impossible to assume or mandate that all participating students at the 24 targeted schools attend the extended day program or to ensure the students in need the most are in attendance. The extended day program follows an alternative school's model which does not promote rigor, deep learning opportunities, or further develop highly effective teachers and principals. The data charts were lacking in necessary details the majority of the time.  The applicant has not comprehensively addressed how it will build upon the core assurance areas and most importantly, it is very unclear how the applicant proposes to facilitate personalized learning environments.		
Total	210	43